

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,120,256 to Walden (hereinafter, "Walden"). By this Amendment, Applicants propose to amend claim 11. Claims 3 and 8-14 are pending in the above-captioned patent application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 3 and 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 9-11, for example are not anticipated by Walden because the reference fails to teach each and every element of the claims. In particular, Walden at least fails to disclose the claimed "non-elastic metallic engaging portions" (claim 9), "non-elastic metallic engaging projections" (claim 10), and "non-elastic metallic holding fixture" (claim 11).

The Examiner alleges that the claimed first and second connector sections correspond to housing 12 and 12' (apparently 121 in Fig. 5), respectively. Moreover, the Examiner contends that "non-elastic engaging portions (114A, figure 7 shows [that] the metallic engaging portions is [sic] adjacent to a surface of the first connector section) provided in the first connector section are latched with elastic metallic projections (114A, figures 5 and 7 show [that] metallic projections 114 is [sic] spaced from a surface of the second connector section)" Office Action, pp. 2-3.

As shown in Fig. 2, however, dimples 114A are provided on clip 80. In connection with the embodiment shown in Fig. 5, two such clips are provided: one being attached to housing 12 and the other attached to housing 12'. Since Walden does not distinguish between the two clips, but rather designates them with the same reference character and otherwise shows them to be identical, clips 80 and dimples 114A

provided thereon are deemed to be the same. Thus, dimple 114A on clip 80 attached to housing 12 (allegedly corresponding to the claimed first connector section) cannot be non-elastic, while dimple 114a on clip 80 attached to housing 12' (121 in Fig. 5) is elastic because both are made of the same material.

Although Walden fails to expressly teach whether dimples 114A are elastic or non-elastic, the reference does teach that a latch bar portion of clip 80 having "flexibility" such that it "deflect[s] over the abutment member 60." Walden, col. 7, lines 42-45. To the extent such teachings suggest that dimple 114A on clip 80 attached to housing 12 is elastic, dimple 114A on clip 80 attached to housing 12' must also be elastic. Accordingly, at a minimum, Walden fails to teach the claimed "non-elastic metallic engaging portions provided in said first connector section" (claim 9), "non-elastic metallic engaging projections provided in said first connector section" (claim 10), and "nibs of a non-elastic metallic holding fixture provided in said first connection section" (claim 11).

Further, with respect to claim 11, the Examiner suggests that standoffs 32 of Walden correspond to leg sections and leg portions of the first and second connector sections. See Office Action, p. 3. However, Walden does not disclose that standoffs 32 are "bent alongside of said contact terminals," as recited in claim 11. Furthermore, although retaining clip 80 is shown to be bent in Fig. 2, Walden does not disclose the relationship between retaining clip 80 and the contacts of Walden. Therefore, retaining clip 80 does correspond to the claimed "leg sections" and "leg portions." Accordingly, Walden fails to teach a "first connector section having leg sections which are bent alongside of said contact terminals to be fixed to said first circuit board and said second

connector section having leg portions which are bent alongside of said contact terminals to be fixed to said second circuit board," as recited in amended claim 11. For these additional reasons, Walden does not anticipate claim 11.

Accordingly, claims 9-11 are allowable at least for these reasons, and claims 3, 8, and 12-14 are allowable at least due to their corresponding dependence from claims 9 and 11.


Applicants respectfully submit that their proposed changes to claim 11 do not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search. Entry of this Amendment After Final is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.



Dated: January 12, 2006

By: Res. No. 34,731
for John M. Romary
Reg. No. 26,331